

IN THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figures 5A, 5B, and 7. These sheets, which include Figures 5A, 5B, and 7, replace the original sheets including Figures 5A, 5B, and 7.

Attachment: Two Replacement Sheets

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 are pending in this case. Claims 1-4 are amended and Claim 5 and 6 are added by the present amendment. Claims 1-6 are supported by the original disclosure and, thus, add no new subject matter.¹

The outstanding Office Action objected to the title. Figures 5A, 5B, and 7 were objected to. Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art, specifically Figure 7, and Lebrun et. al. (US Pat. No. 6,359,608, herein "Lebrun").

First, Applicant and Applicant's representatives thank Examiners Mengistu and Sitta for the courtesy of an interview with Applicant's representatives on April 9, 2007. During the interview, proposed amendments to the claims were discussed. Examiner Sitta agreed to reconsider the rejections of record after formal submission of the present response.

Second, the specification is amended to include a more descriptive title. Therefore, the objection to the specification is believed to be overcome.

Third, Figures 5A, 5B, and 7 are amended to correct the informalities. Therefore, the objection to Figures 5A, 5B, and 7 is believed to be overcome.

Finally, Applicant respectfully traverses the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of the claims.

Amended Claim 1 recites a display apparatus in which image lines of a first system are connected to the first sampling switch and image lines of a second system are connected to the second sampling switch to prevent interference of the image signal between the two sampling switches due to overlapping of the precharging and sampling pulses.

¹ See Specification at page 17, lines 17-22.

Lebrun describes a column driver which *simultaneously* precharges all the columns before sequentially sampling them. Lebrun does not teach or suggest the switch connection configuration included in Claim 1. In fact, because Lebrun describes simultaneously precharging all the columns, the switch configuration included in Claim 1, to prevent temporal overlap of the precharging pulse applied to a second sampling switch with the sampling pulse applied to a first sampling switch, is not necessary in Lebrun. Further, the temporal overlap included in Claim 1 is not possible in Lebrun. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claim 1 and all claims dependent therefrom be withdrawn.

Amended Claim 4 is directed to a driving method of a display apparatus and includes connecting image lines of a first system to a first sampling switch and image lines of a second system to a second sampling switch to avoid interference from the temporal overlap between a sampling pulse applied to the first sampling switch and a precharging pulse applied to the second sampling switch. As discussed above, Lebrun does not teach or suggest the possibility of such a temporal overlap or a method of connecting image lines to sampling switches to avoid interference from such an overlap. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

New Claim 5 is supported at least by Claim 4. Claim 5 is directed to a method of driving an active matrix display and comprises applying two pulses such that the sampling pulse is applied to a first switch of a first image line system at a same time that the precharging pulse is applied to a second switch of a second image line system.

As discussed above, Lebrun does not teach or suggest such a switch arrangement. Thus, Claim 5 is patentable over Lebrun.

New Claim 6 is supported at least by Claim 1. Claim 6 is directed to a display apparatus and includes image lines of a first system connected to a first sampling switch and

Application No. 10/820,048
Reply to Office Action of February 9, 2007

image lines of a second system connected to a second sampling switch to prevent interference of the image signal between the first and second sampling switches due to the temporally overlapping relationship between the precharge pulse applied to the second sampling switch and the sampling pulse applied the first sampling switch.


Lebrun does not teach or suggest image lines connected in the manner included in Claim 6. As discussed above, the temporal overlap included in Claim 6 is not possible in Lebrun because all the columns in Lebrun are simultaneously precharged. Also, because of the simultaneous precharge of all the columns in Lebrun, the image line connection recited in Claim 6 is not needed in Lebrun.

Thus, Claim 6 is patentable over Lebrun.

Accordingly, the outstanding rejections are traversed and the pending claims are believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle

Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Edward W. Tracy, Jr.
Registration No. 47,998

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)